Commonwealth of Massachusetts Executive Office of Environmental Affairs ■ MEPA Office

Environmental ENF Notification Form

For Office Use Only Executive Office of Environmental Affairs

EOEA No.: 12873 MEPA Analystice Andrea Dames Phone: 617-626-1028

The information requested on this form must be completed to begin MEPA Review in accordance with the provisions of the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act, 301 CMR 11.00.

				CANADA CA		
Project Name: Quissett Harbor Pre	servation	Trust Revetmen	t Reconstruc	ction		
Street: Quissett Harbor Road						
Municipality: Falmouth		Watershed: Cape Cod				
Universal Transverse Mercator Coordinates:		Latitude: 41-32-30				
		Longitude: 70-39-39				
Estimated commencement date:		Estimated completion date:				
Approximate cost:		Status of project design: 100 %complete				
Proponent: Quissett Harbor Preservation Trust, Inc. c/o Dana F. Rodin, Goulston & Storrs						
Street: 400 Atlantic Avenue						
Municipality: Boston		State: MA	Zip Code:			
Name of Contact Person From Whom Copies of this ENF May Be Obtained: Jeffrey L. Johnson						
Firm/Agency: Holmes and McGrath,	Inc.	Street: 362 Gifford Street				
Municipality: Falmouth		State: MA	Zip Code:	02540		
Phone: 508-548-3564	Fax: 508	3-548-9672	E-mail: JJOHNSON MCGRATH	I@HOLMESAND		
Does this project meet or exceed a mandatory EIR threshold (see 301 CMR 11.03)?						
Has this project been filed with MEPA b			⊠No			
Has any project on this site been filed w			⊠No			
	∐Y	es (EOEA No)	⊠No		
Is this an Expanded ENF (see 301 CMR 11.0 a Single EIR? (see 301 CMR 11.06(8)) a Special Review Procedure? (see 301 CM a Waiver of mandatory EIR? (see 301 CM a Phase I Waiver? (see 301 CMR 11.11)	MR 11.09) R 11.11)	sting: Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes		⊠No ⊠No ⊠No ⊠No		
Identify any financial assistance or land transfer from an agency of the Commonwealth, including the agency name and the amount of funding or land area (in acres): NONE						
Are you requesting coordinated review with any other federal, state, regional, or local agency? \times(Specify: Falmouth Conservation Commission, DEP Waterways License, DEP Water Quality Certification, ACOE.)						

List Local or Federal Permits and Approvals:

Order of Conditions, Chapter 91 License, MEPA Certificate and ACOE Programmatic General Permit.

Which ENF or EIR review threshold(s) does the project meet or exceed (see 301 CMR 11.03):						
☐ Land ☐ Water ☐ Energy ☐ ACEC	☐ Rare Species ☐ Wetlands, V☐ Wastewater ☐ Transportat☐ Solid & Haz			zardous Waste Archaeological		
Summary of Project Size	Existing	Change	Total	State Permits &		
& Environmental Impacts				Approvals		
	LAND					
Total site acreage	N/A			Superseding Order of Conditions		
New acres of land altered		NONE		□ Chapter 91 License		
Acres of impervious area	NONE	NONE	NONE	401 Water Quality Certification		
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		NONE		MHD or MDC Access Permit		
Square feet of new other wetland alteration		NONE		☐ Water Management _ Act Permit		
Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways		NONE				
STRI	Extension Permit					
Gross square footage	NONE	NONE	NONE	Other Permits		
Number of housing units	NONE	NONE	NONE	(including Legislative Approvals) - Specify:		
Maximum height (in feet)	NONE	NONE	NONE	Authorization from the		
TRANSPORTATION Army Corps of Engineers (AC						
Vehicle trips per day	NONE	NONE	NONE	Liiginoois (700L)		
Parking spaces	NONE	NONE	NONE			
WATER/V	WASTEWATER	<u> </u>				
Gallons/day (GPD) of water use	NONE	NONE	NONE			
GPD water withdrawal	NONE	NONE	NONE			
GPD wastewater generation/ treatment	NONE	NONE	NONE			
Length of water/sewer mains (in miles)	NONE	NONE	NONE			

natural resources to any purpose not in accordance with Ar	ticle 9	17?
Yes (Specify)	⊠No
Will it involve the release of any conservation restriction, p restriction, or watershed preservation restriction?	reser	vation restriction, agricultural preservation
☐Yes (Specify	_)	⊠No
RARE SPECIES: Does the project site include Estimated Fare Species, or Exemplary Natural Communities?		t of Rare Species, Vernal Pools, Priority Sites of ⊠No
HISTORICAL /ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Does to listed in the State Register of Historic Place or the inventory Commonwealth?	y of H	istoric and Archaeological Assets of the
☐Yes (Specify)	⊠No
If yes, does the project involve any demolition or destructio archaeological resources?	n of a	ny listed or inventoried historic or
☐Yes (Specify)	□No
AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN: Is a Environmental Concern?	the pro	oject in or adjacent to an Area of Critical
☐Yes (Specify)	⊠No

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project description should include (a) a description of the project site, (b) a description of both on-site and off-site alternatives and the impacts associated with each alternative, and (c) potential on-site and off-site mitigation measures for each alternative (You may attach one additional page, if necessary.)

Owned and managed by Salt Pond Bird Sanctuaries, Inc., The Knob is a privately held, undeveloped parcel of land, open to the public for conservation and recreational use. Surrounded by Buzzards Bay to the north and west and Quissett Harbor to the south and east, the 12+ acre Knob peninsula has been subjected to significant erosion and deterioration from a combination of natural processes and heavy public use. The entire perimeter of the Knob is armored with stone riprap on all seaward sides. The riprap extends eastward on both sides as shown on the accompanying plan. Rising from its base to varying elevations ranging from 8 to 26 feet NGVD, the stone riprap rises steeply from an abutting coastal beach, land under the ocean, and rocky intertidal shore. The Federal Emergency Management Agency has mapped this site as Velocity Zone up to elevations 20, 22, and 26 feet (NGVD).

Working closely with Salt Pond Bird Sanctuaries, Inc., Aubrey Consulting, Inc. (ACI) conducted a comprehensive examination of the Knob and in March of 1998 prepared a comprehensive Management Plan for the Knob property. The management plan describes the natural history and coastal dynamics of the site, identifies significant areas of erosion, analyzes suggested management practices and provides a prioritized list of both long and short term recommendations to protect and conserve the natural and cultural interests of the Knob.

Following the recommendations in the ACI management plan, the proposed project includes the reconstruction of the entire 1400 +/- linear foot riprap and to incorporate two sets of stone stairways into the revetment, to reconstruct the steps up to the top of The Knob as stone steps, to construct a stone terrace at the top of the Knob, and to plant disturbed portions of the bank above the riprap and the construction access route upon completion of the work. Work will take place on a coastal bank, in land under the ocean, land containing shellfish, on a rocky intertidal shore, a small section of salt marsh, a coastal beach and land subject to coastal storm flowage.

As designed, the proposed riprap will strengthen the stability of the coastal bank and preserve the natural integrity of the bank. The completed riprap will extend no further seaward than the existing riprap. Since riprap presently exists along the toe of the coastal bank, the proposed riprap will not change the volume or form of adjacent or down drift beaches. The riprap is designed in accordance with the Corps of Engineer's method for the design of riprap shore construction.

Primarily due to public use, significant erosion has also taken place on the uphill approach to and at the top of The Knob itself. To preserve this natural resource for continued public enjoyment, a set of stone steps is proposed to replace the existing unpaved path on the uphill approach to The Knob. Additionally a flat stone terrace is proposed for the top of The Knob itself. The perimeter of the terrace at the top of the coastal bank will be vegetated. Existing vegetation will be preserved as much as possible. Any disturbed existing vegetation will be replaced in kind and supplemented with additional plantings as shown on the accompanying plan.

Several Alternatives were considered to the riprap reconstruction proposed. The Alternatives are to do nothing, to remove the riprap and allow the natural processes to continue, to try non-structural management solutions or to rebuild the riprap.

The chosen Alternative of repairing the riprap has the following benefits;

- 1. The riprap repair will be temporary in nature with a limited construction access.
- 2. The riprap should restore integrity to the riprap, which should last for decades.
- 3. The public access should be preserved and be safe.
- 4. A significant cultural resource will be preserved.
- 5. No change in Coastal processes.

The chosen Alternative has the following risks or drawbacks:

- 1. This is the most expensive alternative.
- 2. There is a risk that the aesthetics might be threatened.
- 3. There will be short-term environmental impacts.

The attached narrative more fully describes all alternatives considered.